
REMARKS

Claim Rejections Under U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 14-15 and 18 were rejected under 35 § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chen et al.* (U. S. Patent No. 6,324,602 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

After two telephonic interviews with the Examiner regarding the instant application, Applicants maintain their previous arguments that *Chen et al.* neither teaches nor suggests Applicants' invention of a flash memory that has both an RDRAM interface and data connections that communicate data on both rising and falling edges of a clock signal. While *Chen et al.* mentions a flash memory as a type of memory and discusses a RAMBUS proprietary interface in a separate paragraph, a flash memory with a RAMBUS interface is not disclosed.

The claims have been amended above to present the rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal.

Claims 16, 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chen et al.*, in view of *Deneroff et al.* (U. S. Patent No. 6,215,686 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Since *Chen et al.* neither teaches nor suggests Applicants' invention, the combination of *Chen et al.* with *Deneroff et al.* cannot disclose Applicants' invention.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance and requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney to discuss any questions that may remain with respect to the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Roohparvar et al.

By their Representatives,

Leffert Jay & Polglaze, P.A.

P.O. Box 581009

Minneapolis, MN 55458-1009

(612) 312-2211

Date

4/30/03

By

Kenneth W. Bolvin

Kenneth W. Bolvin

Reg. No. 34,125